

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED
<input type="checkbox"/> ENTERED	<input type="checkbox"/> SERVED ON
COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD	
JAN 26 2010	
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
BY: _____	DEPUTY _____

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HOWARD LEE WHITE,
Plaintiff,

v.

DELMAR SNIDER, *et al.*,
Defendant.

3:08-CV-252-RCJ(VPC)

ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (#74) ("Recommendation") entered on November 23, 2009. This action was referred to U.S. Magistrate Valerie P. Cooke, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and LR IB 1-4. After a thorough review, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court enter an order that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#54) be granted in part and denied in part. No objection to the Report and Recommendation has been filed.

I. DISCUSSION

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Further, under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), if a party makes a timely objection to the magistrate judge's recommendation, then this Court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made."¹ Nevertheless, the statute does not

¹ For an objection to be timely, a party must serve and file it within 10 days after being served with the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).


1 "require[] some lesser review by [this Court] when no objections are filed." Thomas v. Arn,
2 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). Instead, under the statute, this Court is not required to conduct
3 "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." Id. at 149. Similarly,
4 the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate
5 judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States
6 v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed
7 by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were
8 made); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading
9 the Ninth Circuit's decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not
10 required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no
11 objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then this Court may accept the
12 recommendation without review. See e.g., Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting,
13 without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed).

14 In this case, defendant has not filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and
15 Recommendation. Although no objection was filed, this Court has reviewed the Report and
16 Recommendation (#74), and accepts it. Accordingly,

17 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#54) is
18 GRANTED in part as to any claim against Defendant Skolnik, and DENIED as to remaining
19 Defendants Snider, Mar and Bannister. The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment
20 accordingly.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: This 26 day of January, 2010.

23
24
25 
26 Robert C. Jones
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28